

(short 436 million pounds). This analysis showed the 1966 wheat crop in the United States is much smaller than was expected and raises a question of whether the United States is now moving toward a wheat crisis.

The report stated: "A flood of wheat has been pouring from U.S. bins to ease hunger abroad. What was once a great glut of grain now is largely gone.

"At the start of this year's harvest, U.S. wheat reserves have dropped below the amount held necessary to meet emergencies. Wheat-belt elevators that were chock-full five years ago now are nearly empty."

The United Press International in a dispatch from Washington, D.C. on May 21, 1966, reported, "Federal farm officials are facing a major policy decision on the issue of butter supplies for school lunchrooms—the surplus stockpile that once seemed bottomless is gone.

"In the past, school lunch needs have been met by donations from butter stocks held by the Government under the Federal dairy price support program.

"Now Agriculture officials say they have no surplus butter, and they do not know whether there will be any during the current flush milk producing season."

An indication of the developing meat shortages is reported in an Associated Press dispatch of May 14, 1966, which showed that the meat imports are running thirty-four percent ahead of last year. Imports of red meats (beef and veal) are expected to total over 685 million pounds this year and pork imports were over 85 million tons during the first three months of 1966. A substantial amount of pork was imported from communist Poland in the form of canned hams.

The Associated Press on May 31, 1966 reported that pork prices have increased by twenty-five percent in the last twelve months, and that they are still going up. The same dispatch stated that a check made of assorted fresh meat retail prices showed a rise of 21½ percent from March 1965 to March 1966. A survey in Washington, D.C. indicated bread, milk and rice to be up four cents, and potatoes up from fifteen to twenty-five cents per ten pounds. The increase in food prices all over the United States is obvious to any American housewife. This is the law of supply and demand in action and the shortages are pushing up the prices.

The Omaha Sun of June 5, 1966 stated: "Shipments abroad plus a drop in production have caused a decline in wheat stocks. Recently, the Department of Agriculture estimated reserve supplies may fall to 350 million bushels before the 1967 crop starts moving to market. This is considered below a safe level for emergency needs. They said the need is 600 million bushels." In spite of this situation we have been exporting food as usual.

The N.Y. Times service warned on October 31, 1965: "The United States is running out of surplus food. As a result of growing exports for cash, food give-aways at home and abroad and restraints on production, excess stocks of farm commodities that are edible have declined, in nearly all cases to levels near or below the normal inventory needed for reserves."

"Dairy products give a good illustration of the changing situation. Surpluses are so sharply reduced that from time to time, in recent years, give-aways abroad had to be curtailed because the Government had no stocks."

"Of all the variety of crops grown, wheat is by far the most important in 'Food for Peace.' The total of shipments abroad ran about \$1,900,000,000 annually in the last two years, and wheat accounts for two-thirds of this."

Back in 1964 the Associated Press, in checking on the "Food for Peace" program, found that from 1954 to 1964 we shipped overseas \$12,300,000,000 worth of agricultural prod-

ucts. Of this enormous sum, sixty-three percent was sold for foreign currencies (unusable except in the foreign country itself).

As the population of these countries increased so have their demands on the United States as a source of food. The funds we give away on loan (never to be repaid) have become so expected by the foreign countries that they are figured in their operating budgets. In the same way they have become dependent on the United States for food.

In the meantime American farmers have had their help lured away by higher wages in the industrial areas for those who want to work, and government welfare programs for those who do not want to work. An article in the Denver Post of May 16, 1966 stated: "Prominent farmers in this agricultural community (La Jara, Colo.) predicted Saturday afternoon that the farm manpower situation threatens to bring on a nationwide food shortage. . . . They blamed: An exodus of farm workers to other jobs. . . . Stoppage of the bracero program 18 months ago by Congress. Inability of farmers to pay wages that compete with industry. Their belief that War on Poverty and other welfare programs are robbing farmers of laborers. Government programs which control farm markets. . . . They contend poverty war officials have misrepresented the facts by leading all farm workers to believe they are eligible for training in the program. . . . they said hundreds of farm workers here decline farm jobs because they believe that if they're unemployed they automatically qualify for War on Poverty training."

According to the Allen-Scott Report of July 7, 1966, President Johnson promised Prime Minister Gandhi of India, during her visit to the United States in March of 1966, that the United States will supply India with nine and one-half million tons of wheat in spite of the fact that India is carrying on active trade with communist North Vietnam. The report stated: "If the Indian government wishes, the President indicated, the U.S. would be willing to work with the Soviet to solve India's food needs. 'This is the kind of international cooperation which I favor,' declared the President." With the Soviets unable to supply enough food for their own people their part of the "cooperation" would probably be to take credit for what we were doing, one of their favorite tricks.

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman has sought to calm concern over the dwindling U.S. wheat supplies and the dropping estimates for the 1966 wheat crop due to adverse weather. He has opposed a provision in a bill banning credit sales to nations which trade with North Vietnam and Cuba. However, he is not known to be an anti-communist and his department was the first government department to be penetrated by communists. The Hal Ware cell was in the Agriculture Department and from there the communists branched out with espionage units and underground cells in other government departments. Documentation concerning this can be found in the Senate Internal Security Hearings on "Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments."

Orville Freeman was born in Minneapolis, May 9, 1918. He graduated from the University of Minnesota in 1942 and after the war received his LL.B. from the same university (1946). He became a friend of Hubert H. Humphrey, Jr., who later, as mayor of Minneapolis, selected Freeman for his assistant. Freeman was associated with Humphrey in the formation of the Democratic Farmer Labor Party which took many radicals into its ranks.

Freeman married Miss Jane Charlotte Shields of Winston-Salem, North Carolina, on May 2, 1942. The 1934 edition of "America's Young Men" showed that her father, James Montgomery Shields, was principal of the Winston-Salem Junior High School and pointed out that he was active in the Progressive Education Movement, headed by

John Dewey of Columbia University. This movement has proved to be the ruination of our schools and has the broader purpose of preparing young Americans for a new social order.

Freeman has long been a dues-paying member of the radical left-wing Americans for Democratic Action (ADA) and also the Americans Civil Liberties Union which has in the past been cited by State and Federal authorities as a communist front and which up to the present time mainly defends communists, atheists and pornographers.

When the Billy Sol Estes scandal was breaking, Mr. N. Battle Hales, an attorney working for the Department of Agriculture, endeavored to show Secretary Freeman that he had a lot of evidence in his files which proved that favoritism had been shown to certain individuals. He had already warned of the activities of Billy Sol. Thereafter, Hales suddenly found himself barred from his office and files while Freeman's staff members seized his files. Hales' secretary, Margaret Kimbrough, who protested the file seizure, was forcibly removed from the office and the building and spirited away to a mental hospital. Secretary Freeman had appointed the notorious Billy Sol Estes as a member of the Cotton Advisory Committee of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and Estes was involved in cotton allotment deals, grain and fertilizer storage facilities frauds.

The question of grain storage bin frauds was not new to the Department of Agriculture. On January 16, 1956, the Senate Committee on Government Operations issued a report entitled, "Inefficiencies in the Department of Agriculture Grain Bin Program." This report showed that bins were erected of substandard materials, that the government was overcharged, that bins leaked out grains, that because of faulty construction they were subject to rodent and vermin infestation, and that little or no effort was made by the Department of Agriculture to get back money paid on fraudulent claims.

The Department of Agriculture was created by President Lincoln to "acquire and diffuse" information designed to promote agriculture. At the time of its 100th Anniversary (1962), according to Congressman James A. Haley, "The Agriculture Department now sprawls all over the world. Its budget for the new fiscal year is set at \$5.8 billion, and it will spend much more. It has more than 90,000 employees—about one for each 40 farmers—and is growing fast. The number of farms and farmers in the United States has been dwindling steadily—but the Agriculture Department gained 3,700 employees last year alone."

Rep. Haley discussed the Department's role in "acquiring and diffusing" information on everything "from infant care to African violets," and continued:

"But the Department does more than this. It fixes prices, controls acreage, tells farmers what to plant and where and how much. It owns a vast hoard of 'surplus' crops and while it is constantly selling these in huge quantities at great loss to the taxpayers, and giving away great volumes of foodstuffs, it is day by day acquiring and storing, also at great loss to the taxpayers, far more than it can get rid of."

The Department has fooled Rep. Haley and has gotten rid of too much of its surpluses and thereby created a dangerous situation. The controls, however, remain and the regulations have increased. With the realization that continued controls on farmers through the collectivist programs of the Department of Agriculture were doing more harm than good, and in an effort to restore the true free enterprise system, Congressman E. Ross Adair of Indiana on February 9, 1961 introduced a bill (HR 4051) "To free farmers from Government control." The bill, which was not passed unfortunately, began with the following statement:

A 4762

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

September 25, 1967

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, shall be hereby repealed."

By repealing this one act all authority for Federal control would be removed. The original AAA which the Roosevelt cabal created in 1933 was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. However, by 1938 Roosevelt had "packed" the Supreme Court and an even worse AAA was upheld. Concerning these federal agricultural programs, Dan Smoot has stated:

"Official investigation has revealed that the federal agricultural programs, thus initiated by Henry Wallace during the first two terms of Franklin D. Roosevelt, were actually created by communists in the Department of Agriculture, for the purpose of communizing agriculture in the United States.

"But the official purpose—the political argument which persuaded Congress to authorize, and the public to accept the federal agricultural programs—was to save the small farmers of America."

Not only have these programs not "saved the small farmers of America," they have all but eliminated them, and are now doing the same thing for the "big farmers of America." The AAA was described by George N. Peek, its first administrator who saw the members of the Hal Ware communist cell in action there. In his book, "Why Quit Our Own," he says: "A plague of young lawyers settled on Washington . . . in the legal division were formed the plans which eventually turned the AAA from a device to aid the farmer to a device to introduce the collectivist system of agriculture into this country. . . . They wanted to purge the AAA of all businessmen or any others who did not welcome the coming of the new day of revolution. . . . Most of that crowd . . . were Communists."

The members of Hal Ware's "parent" Communist cell, identified as such in sworn testimony, who worked for the original Agricultural Adjustment Administration were Alger Hiss, Lee Pressman, John Abt, Nathan Witt, Nathaniel Weyl and Charles Kramer. Another employee took the Fifth Amendment regarding membership in the Communist Party. Also working for this original AAA were Adlai Stevenson and Abe Fortas. Hal Ware worked as a "consultant" to the Agriculture Department after having served in the U.S.S.R. as a leader in the Soviet collective farm program under both Lenin and Stalin.

The program initiated by these communists is still in operation, and complete government control has been outlined by the Office of Emergency Planning when in "crises requiring extraordinary measures by the United States, the President or Congress might formally declare a national emergency." They state in Chapter 8 of "The National Plan for Emergency Preparedness."

"USDA (U.S. Dept. of Agriculture) national headquarters, subject to overall policy guidance and coordination by OEP, would direct the Nation's food program. . . . To the extent conditions permitted, overall direction of emergency operating programs would be conducted from national headquarters." They define "food" to include anything capable of being eaten or drunk and starting from the time it is a seed or on the hoof or in any state of development or preparation. The authority for turning control of the nation's food over to the government is found in Executive Order 10998, Assigning Emergency Preparedness Functions to the Secretary of Agriculture (27 FR 1524).

When the government is able to completely control a nation's food supply, the inhabitants either agree with it or starve. John Noble, who spent a number of years in a

Soviet slave labor camp without ever having been given a trial for his unknown offense, has stated that the communist plan is to keep the people on a low calorie diet on which they can just barely subsist. Even this small amount of food is made difficult to obtain. . . . involving standing on long lines and waiting for rations. So much time and effort goes into getting the food and so much thought is given to the hungry pangs that very little time and energy are left to think about rights and freedom. The unhappy conditions do not exist for the elite of the Communist Party, however, who have special stores from which they can obtain any delicacy they wish. The "In" crowd eats and lives well even in the "peoples' democracies." It is just the people who nominally own everything who have nothing.

In non-communist countries when food is scarce and prices soar, many low-income families go hungry because they cannot afford to buy enough food. Reports received from contacts who have visited India indicate there is food available for those who have the money to buy it. The problem is that there are many poor who have remained poor in spite of the tremendous foreign aid given to India. It seems the aid just does not reach the ordinary people. On the other hand, in this so-called democracy there are many who possess fantastic wealth, live in magnificent splendor but do nothing to assist the poor of their own country, nor does their government arrange a tax system system which might benefit their people as is done in true democracies.

The food situation here in our own country is deteriorating and there is talk of "inflation" and "price controls." But even with dangerous shortages in basic foods developing, the federal government is still curbing production and giving away food. Dire predictions are being made. The N.Y. Times of August 16, 1966 reported the judgment of a group of scientists that man is multiplying faster than the food supply. The article states: "A group of scientists agreed today that man was rushing toward catastrophe. . . . This appraisal of mankind's probable fate, in the not distant future, was made at the 1966 annual meeting of the American Institute of Biological Sciences, being held this week at the University of Maryland."

The scientists noted that pumping food into have-not nations only causes the population to rise, which makes the problem worse. The article stated: "As food-population pressures rise, they contended, the more will be the impulse toward war among the powers trying to control sources of supply." The United States, being a prime source of supply, will therefore be a target for the communists whose supply is always low due to the deficiency of their system of government, if these scientists have predicted correctly.

Constant warnings of impending world famines are going unheeded by the bureaucrats in Washington. Perhaps they will follow the Red Chinese practice which was simple. When there is not enough food for everyone, let a few million starve to death.

Proposed ABM Defense System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 25, 1967

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the reasoning behind Secretary McNamara's

proposed ABM defense system continues to confuse a great number of responsible citizens of this country.

Although we can be thankful that he is at last aware of the danger of letting our adversaries gain an advantage, we nevertheless are not satisfied with the Secretary's piecemeal ABM approach. This general dissatisfaction is very clearly expressed in the September 21, 1967, editorial of the State, Columbia, S.C.

In an article entitled "Better Than Nothing," Editor W. D. Workman, Jr., points out the unrealism of Mr. McNamara's reasoning.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BETTER THAN NOTHING

The Defense Department's proposed anti-ballistic missile deployment probably will be better than nothing—but not much better, and certainly not adequate.

For one thing, the projected ABM system is to be geared to the threat of a possible nuclear attack coming from Red China. It apparently will not be designated to offer any protection against missiles coming from other areas, whether from the vastness that is Russia (and Siberia) or the island that is Cuba or elsewhere.

For another thing, as the American Security Council so well points out, "the value of a system of deterrence is that which the enemy believes about it."

Is Defense Secretary McNamara's ABM system believable? Will our Communist enemies be convinced that it affords America a high degree of defense capability? Or will they merely snort at the system, completed or not, and launch an attack when the time seems right according to their time-table and their opportunity?

Secretary McNamara has vigorously opposed the whole notion of an ABM defense system ever since he took over the Defense Department and imposed his own peculiar ideas upon it. Now, he seems to have been pushed to the point of acquiescing in the establishment of a \$5 billion system which required more than \$4 billion just to research. What will the grudging \$5 billion actually buy us?

Protection against Red China, says McNamara. But what about Russia?

Red Star, the official publication of the Russian armed services, stated on June 3 of this year: "The Soviet Union has always been and will continue to be the main political and material base of the world revolutionary process."

Translated, that means Russia is still our first enemy. The Red Chinese are our enemies too, but Communism's base lies in Russia.

And is Secretary McNamara's ABM system designed to protect Americans against a Russian attack?

Well, no, not exactly. You see, the Cold War is over, it says here. Russia is not expected to attack the United States. We have only the "irresponsible" Chinese to fear.

This is unrealism carried to the "Nth" degree, or perhaps to the "McNth" degree.

We should be thankful that McNamara has at least, and at last, been budged to the point of agreeing to a partial ABM defense system. But when will we get the full defense system which the Joint Chiefs of Staff have long recommended?